



1616

#15

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of: Brown
Serial No.: 09/478,071
Filed: January 01, 2000
For: High Unsaponifiables and Methods of Using the Same
Atty. Docket No.: 511-003

Art Group: 1616
Examiner: Levy, N.

JUN 22 2004

Box Non Fee Amendment
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

TECH CENTER 1600/2800

**Submission of Non-Entered Paper and Request to Rescind Holding of
Abandonment**

Dear Sir:

The applicant respectfully requests that the office rescind the holding of abandonment in the above referenced matter. This application was inadvertently abandoned by the US Patent and Trademark Office, through no fault of the applicant. Telephone conversations with the examiner in the matter indicate that a required paper, which was timely submitted was not entered in the case.

Please find enclosed a true and accurate copies of the last office action received and responsive paper this office submitted in the above referenced matter. Please note the dates on the certificates of mailing, clearly indicating that the responsive paper was timely submitted.

Therefore, since the abandonment was not the fault of the application, the applicant respectfully requests that the abandonment be rescinded and the application proceed through prosecution.


In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: 5/29/04


Kristofer Halvorson, Reg. No. 39,211
The Halvorson Law Firm, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
405 W. Southern Ave., Suite 1
Tempe, Arizona 85282
(480) 449-3600

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage paid, in an envelope addressed to: Box Non Fee Amendment, Assistant Commission for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria VA 22313-1450

on 5/29/04

By: 



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/478,071	01/03/2000	LEE ROY COPELAND	511-003	1167

7590

04/18/2002

THE HALVORSON LAW FIRM
405 W SOUTHERN AVE
SUITE 1
TEMPE, AZ 85282

EXAMINER

LEVY, NEIL S

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1616

DATE MAILED: 04/18/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

JUN 22 2004

TECH CENTER 1600/2000



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

11

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

OFFICE ACTION SUMMARY

JUN 22 2004

TECH CENTER 1600/2300

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11/7/02

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, **prosecution as to the merits is closed** in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 D.C. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 1-47 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) 14-21, 35-47 is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 1-13, 22-34 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☒ Claims 1-47 are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☐ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been

☒ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received.

Receipt is acknowledged of Response of 1/07/02.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claims 14-21, 35-47 stand withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 7.

Claims 1-13, 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The rejection of record is maintained.

The last amendment was to claims 1 and 22, reviewed on 7/02/01, no amendment was submitted with the remarks of 1/07/02.

Claims 1-13, 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Laur et al 5679393.

The rejection of record is maintained.

See col. 1, first paragraph; intended use; see example 10.

Claims 1-13, 22-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Koulbanis-FR 241775.

The rejection of record is maintained.

Here, too (p. 5, 11-16) is the use of polar ingredients.

Claims 1-9, 22-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Monnier et al 5705722.

The rejection of record is maintained.

The compositions meet the instant claim language, no particular patentable weight given to the processing, since it is not critical, and the claims are to a composition.

Applicant's arguments filed 1/7/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments are directed to the processing, but claimed are compositions met by the prior art.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Neil Levy whose telephone number is 308-2412. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday- Friday 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

Application/Control Number: 09/478,071
Art Unit: 1616

Page 4

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jose Dees can be reached on 308-4628. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 305-4556 for regular communications and 305-3592 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 308-1235.

Levy:mv
March 28, 2002



NEIL S. LEVY
PRIMARY EXAMINER



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Application of:	Brown	Art Group:	1616
Serial No.:	09/478,071	Examiner:	Levy, N.
Filed:	January 01, 2000		
For:	High Unsaponifiables and Methods of Using the Same		
Atty. Docket No.:	511-003		

Box Non Fee Amendment
Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Response to Office Action Dated 4/18/02

Dear Sir:

Responsive to the Official Action dated 4/18/02, kindly amend the subject application as follows:

Clean Version of Replacement Sections

In the Claims:

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. A composition for topical application comprising polar hydrophilic salts mixed with non-polar unsaponifiables, said polar hydrophilic salts being the products of hydrolysis of a saponifiable fraction in the original organic materials, said original organic materials comprising at least 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials.
2. The composition of claim 1 wherein said original organic materials were pre-treated prior to hydrolysis, said pre-treatment selected from the group of treatments

consisting of alkoxylation, polymerization, acetylation, oxidation, reduction, concentration, hydrogenation, partial hydrogenation, interesterification, double bond modification, randomization, and refinement.

3. The composition of claim 2 wherein said pre-treated original organic materials further comprises extracts selected from the group consisting of amaranth seed oil, anise seed oil, avocado seed oil, barley oil, briza oil, buck wheat oil, candelilla wax, carnuba wax, cassia occidentalis oil, coffee bean oil, deoiled lecithin, dog fish oil, esparto wax, oils from fungi and other microorganisms, guayule plant extract, jojoba oil, jurinea oil, lanolin, laurel berry oil, olestra (olean), olive oil concentrate (phytosqualene), olive seed oil, orange roughy oil, ouricury wax, quinoa seed oil, rye germ oil, shark liver oil, shea butter, sperm whale oil, sugar cane wax, sunflower wax, tall oil, tall oil distillate, Vegepure from wheat grains, and wheat germ oil.
4. The composition of claim 1 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
5. The composition of claim 2 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
6. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 1 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
7. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 2 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers,

In re Application of: Brown
Serial No.: 09/478,071
Atty. Docket No.: 511-003

Art Group: 1616
Examiner: Levy, N.

physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.

8. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 4 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
9. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 5 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
10. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 1 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
11. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 2 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
12. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 6 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
13. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 7 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

22. A composition for topical application comprising polar hydrophilic salts mixed with non-polar unsaponifiables, said polar hydrophilic salts being the products of hydrolysis of a saponifiable fraction in the original organic materials, said original organic materials comprising at least 6 weight percent long carbon chain materials prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials, said long carbon chain materials having at least 18 carbons in length.
23. The composition of claim 22 wherein said original organic materials were pre-treated prior to hydrolysis, said pre-treatment selected from the group of treatments consisting of alkoxylation, polymerization, acetylation, oxidation, reduction, concentration, hydrogenation, partial hydrogenation, interesterification, double bond modification, randomization, and refinement.
24. The composition of claim 23 wherein said pre-treated original organic materials further comprises extracts selected from the group consisting of amaranth seed oil, anise seed oil, avocado seed oil, barley oil, briza oil, buck wheat oil, candelilla wax, carnuba wax, cassia occidentalis oil, coffee bean oil, deoiled lecithin, dog fish oil, esparto wax, oils from fungi and other microorganisms, guayule plant extract, jojoba oil, jurinea oil, lanolin, laurel berry oil, olestra (olean), olive oil concentrate (phytosqualene), olive seed oil, orange roughy oil, ouricury wax, quinoa seed oil, rye germ oil, shark liver oil, shea butter, sperm whale oil, sugar cane wax, sunflower wax, tall oil, tall oil distillate, Vegepure from wheat grains, and wheat germ oil.
25. The composition of claim 22 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
26. The composition of claim 23 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

27. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 22 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
28. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 23 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
29. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 25 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
30. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 26 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
31. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 22 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.

In re Application of: .. Brown
Serial No.: 09/478,071
Atty. Docket No.: 511-003

Art Group: 1616
Examiner: Levy, N.

32. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 23 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
33. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 27 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
34. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 28 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

Version with Markings to Show Changes Made

In the Claims:

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. A composition for topical application comprising polar hydrophilic salts mixed with non-polar unsaponifiables, said polar hydrophilic salts being the [which are] products of hydrolysis of a saponifiable fraction in the original organic materials, said original organic materials [further initially] comprising at least 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials.
2. The composition of claim 1 wherein said original organic materials were pre-treated prior to hydrolysis, said pre-treatment selected from the group of treatments consisting of alkoxylation, polymerization, acetylation, oxidation, reduction, concentration, hydrogenation, partial hydrogenation, interesterification, double bond modification, randomization, and refinement.
3. The composition of claim 2 wherein said pre-treated original organic materials further comprises extracts selected from the group consisting of amaranth seed oil, anise seed oil, avocado seed oil, barley oil, briza oil, buck wheat oil, candelilla wax, carnuba wax, cassia occidentalis oil, coffee bean oil, deoiled lecithin, dog fish oil, esparto wax, oils from fungi and other microorganisms, guayule plant extract, jojoba oil, jurinea oil, lanolin, laurel berry oil, olestra (olean), olive oil concentrate (phytosqualene), olive seed oil, orange roughy oil, ouricury wax, quinoa seed oil, rye germ oil, shark liver oil, shea butter, sperm whale oil, sugar cane wax, sunflower wax, tall oil, tall oil distillate, Vegepure from wheat grains, and wheat germ oil.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

4. The composition of claim 1 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
5. The composition of claim 2 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
6. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 1 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
7. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 2 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
8. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 4 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
9. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 5 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

10. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 1 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
11. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 2 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
12. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 6 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
13. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 7 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
22. A composition for topical application comprising polar hydrophilic salts mixed with non-polar unsaponifiables, said polar hydrophilic salts being the [which are] products of hydrolysis of a saponifiable fraction in the original organic materials, said original organic materials [further initially] comprising at least 6 weight percent long carbon chain materials prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials, said long carbon chain materials having at least 18 carbons in length.
23. The composition of claim 22 wherein said original organic materials were pre-treated prior to hydrolysis, said pre-treatment selected from the group of treatments consisting of alkoxylation, polymerization, acetylation, oxidation, reduction, concentration, hydrogenation, partial hydrogenation, interesterification, double bond modification, randomization, and refinement.
24. The composition of claim 23 wherein said pre-treated original organic materials further comprises extracts selected from the group consisting of amaranth seed oil, anise seed oil, avocado seed oil, barley oil, briza oil, buck wheat oil, candelilla wax,

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478.071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

carnuba wax, cassia occidentalis oil, coffee bean oil, deoiled lecithin, dog fish oil, esparto wax, oils from fungi and other microorganisms, guayule plant extract, jojoba oil, jurinea oil, lanolin, laurel berry oil, olestra (olean), olive oil concentrate (phytosqualene), olive seed oil, orange roughy oil, ouricury wax, quinoa seed oil, rye germ oil, shark liver oil, shea butter, sperm whale oil, sugar cane wax, sunflower wax, tall oil, tall oil distillate, Vegepure from wheat grains, and wheat germ oil.

25. The composition of claim 22 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
26. The composition of claim 23 comprising at least 20% by weight of unsaponifiables.
27. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 22 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
28. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 23 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
29. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 25 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers,

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.

30. A substantive composition comprising the composition of claim 26 in combination with at least one ingredient selected from the group consisting of emollients, conditioners, pigments, dyes, pharmaceuticals, ultraviolet radiation absorbers, physical radiation blocks, insect repellants, animal repellants, insecticides, pesticides, herbicides, animal attractants, fragrances, and hormones.
31. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 22 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
32. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 23 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
33. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 27 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.
34. A method of providing substantive benefits to an animal subject comprising applying the composition of claim 28 to the hair, skin, scales, or feathers of an animal subject.

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1-13 and 22-34 are pending. Claims 1-13 and 22-34 were rejected. Claims 1-3 and 22-24 have been amended herein.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The examiner maintained the previous rejection since a set of amended claims apparently were included in the last communication. The applicant includes, herein, a set of amended claims in which claims 1 and 22 are amended to remove the term "further initially" and claim 22 is further amended to include the phrase "prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials" as suggested by the examiner.

Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw the instant rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102 and/or 103

The examiner rejected claims 1-13 and 2-34 as being anticipated by or, in the alternative, as obvious over Laur et al. 5,679,393. The examiner feels that Laur discloses pre-treated mixes of hydrolysis products of organic materials (in col.'s 2 and 3) that provide shea butter (col. 4, line 66 – col. 5, line 18) at the instant 6% + (48%) unsaponifiables as substantive compositions with anti-free radical activity, for dermatological/cosmetic use. Actives and emollient/conditions are added (in col. 7, line 7 to col. 8, line 4). Shea butter, and the soy, avocado, olive sources are all known as containing high % of their oils and fats as long chain carbon materials, as shown by applicant (in pages 10 and 11). Methods of providing benefits to skin are disclosed at col. 5, lines 40-61, examples 7-10, and claims 22 and 23.

In response to the above rejection, Applicant respectfully points out that for a prima facie case of obviousness to be made, §2142 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (M.P.E.P.) requires three basic criteria to be met:

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, and not in the applicants' disclosure. *In re Vaec*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 U.S.P.Q.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991), (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that a prima facie case of obviousness in compliance with the M.P.E.P. has not been made for the invention encompassed by the rejected claims.

Laur does not teach or suggest a composition comprising a mixture of polar hydrophilic salts mixed with non-polar unsaponifiables, each of which are products of the hydrolysis of an original organic material. Thus, in the present invention there is a starting material, which is an organic material, that is subjected to a hydrolysis reaction thereby producing polar hydrophilic salts. These produced polar hydrophilic salts are mixed with the non-polar unsaponifiables originally contained in the original organic material. In the present invention, it is critical that the starting organic material must comprise at least 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials prior to the hydrolysis of the organic materials. The use of starting organic materials comprising at least 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials is critical to the present invention in that they provide benefits not available when one uses starting organic materials comprising less than 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials. This mixture is clearly not disclosed, taught or suggested in Laur.

Laur's primary disclosure is a method for concentrating unsaponifiables by first separating a non-polar fraction, which is rich in unsaponifiables, from the polar fraction of a material using a hot polar solvent. The hot polar solvent is allowed to cool and any resultant solids formed by the cooling are separated from the cooled polar solvent. These solids are also rich in unsaponifiables. These two fractions that are rich in unsaponifiables may then be mixed together. Thus it can be seen that Laur discloses concentrating the

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

naturally occurring concentration present in a material via crystallization or removal of the saponifiable portion without resort to the step of saponification. At no point does Laur create polar hydrophilic salts by hydrolysis of the original organic materials.

This is clearly different from the present application where the naturally occurring high unsaponifiable fraction is mixed with the saponification products (the polar hydrophilic salts) of the original organic material. The original fraction of unsaponifiables are unaffected by the caustic conditions and are mixed with the polar hydrophilic salts created by the hydrolysis reaction on the saponifiable fraction. There is no teaching or suggestion in Laur that polar hydrophilic salts can or should be mixed with a high fraction (6% or greater) of non-polar unsaponifiables. This limitation is only found in the applicant's disclosure. While Laur has a secondary disclosure of refining the natural product by hydrolysis, a clear reading of the disclosure shows that the hydrolysates produced (what Laur calls "soap" or the polar hydrophilic salts) is discarded from the mix and therefore does not form a part of the ultimate product.

Since Laur does not teach or suggest all of the limitations in the claims in the instant application, it cannot anticipate the claims. Further, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made since there is no suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the arts, to modify the Laur to produce the instant invention. Since there is no suggestion or motivation to make the modification, there cannot be a reasonable expectation of success. And finally, there is not teaching or suggestion in the prior art of all of the claim limitations.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-13 and 22-34 as being anticipated by Koulbanis et al. (FR 241775). The examiner feels that page 5 of the translation discloses 20-40% unsaponifiables, with jojoba, sunflower oil, as emollients. The compositions are prepared by mixing extracts; thus, they were inherently pre-treated, at least by refinement (separation of the oil from the vegetable) and is recognized as being a treatment product (in pages 4 and 5).

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

The applicant disagrees with the examiner. What Koulbanis actually discloses is the addition of a previously extracted unsaponifiable component to a blend of two oils, said oils containing an unsaponifiable and a saponifiable portion. What Koulbanis does not disclose, and what is actually claimed, is a composition that is the mixture of non-polar unsaponifiabiles with polar hydrophilic salts, the polar hydrophilic salts being the products of hydrolysis of original organic materials, said organic material initially comprising at least 6 weight percent unsaponifiable materials prior to the hydrolysis of the saponifiable portion. More specifically, Koulbanis does not disclose the hydrolysis of an organic material initially containing at least 6 percent by weight unsaponifiable materials. **Koulbanis does not disclose mixing the polar hydrophilic salts, which are the result of the hydrolysis, and the non-polar unsaponifiabiles that are originally in the organic materials,** regardless of the initial concentration of unsaponifiabiles. In fact, what Koulbanis teaches is the opposite, separation of the unsaponifiabiles from the salts and addition of the separated unsaponifiabiles to other organic material. At most, Koulbanis teaches that the separated unsaponifiable portion may contain a fraction of saponifiable materials, but Koulbanis does not teach that the separated unsaponifiable portion would contain any of the polar salts (which it would not since separation utilizes the non-polar nature of the unsaponifiabiles and would exclude the polar salts). However, in order to advance the present application to issuance, the applicant has amended the claims to further specify the limitations of the present invention. Thus, since Koulbanis does not contain all of the elements of the applicant's invention, as now claims, it does not properly anticipate them. Therefore the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw the instant rejection.

The examiner has rejected claims 1-9 and 22-30 as being anticipated by Monnier et al. (US Pat. 5,705,722). The examiner feels that Monnier discloses (in col 1, last paragraph) pre-processed organics (tall oil) of over 6% unsaponifiabiles (col. 2, top; 10-40%). Examples of UFA's of over C₁₈ are at Example 4. Pre-treatment includes hydro treating (example 2) and other treatment processes (col 3, lines 25-43). Fragrances (aldehydes) are present (Table A).

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.


The applicant respectfully disagrees with the examiner. As previously stated by the applicant, Monnier actually teaches away from the applicant's invention. The first paragraph of col. 2 clearly states that "The tall oil may be a high quality tall oil ... or it may be a crude tall oil which as been processed to remove undesirable components, such as ash and unsaponifiables." Thus, **Monnier actually teaches the removal of the unsaponifiables, not the inclusion as required by the present claims.** Moreover, Monnier, at no point, discloses that the tall oil is hydrolyzed, thereby creating polar hydrophilic salts. At most, Monnier teaches that the tall oil may be depitched (thermal evaporation), solvent extraction, solid-phase adsorption, or liquid chromatography, all of which are to remove unsaponifiables, not include them into the mixture. While Monnier also discloses hydro-treating, **hydro-treating is not hydrolysis and in no way produces the polar salts as required by the claims** as they now stand. Further, inspection of Monnier clearly shows that there is not disclosure of the hydrolysis of tall oil to produce a polar salt portion and a non-polar unsaponifiable portion that are then mixed together. Thus, since Monnier does not include all of the elements of the applicant's claims, as now amended, it does not properly anticipate the applicant's invention. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw the instant rejection.

Conclusion

The applicant has fully responded to the issued presented by the applicant and has patentably differentiated his invention over the prior art. Therefore, the applicant respectfully requests that the examiner withdraw all rejections and allow the claims to pass to issuance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 7/8/02


Kristofer Halvorson, Reg. No. 39,211
The Halvorson Law Firm, P.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
405 W. Southern Ave., Suite 1
Tempe, Arizona 85282
(480) 449-3600

In re Application of:
Serial No.:
Atty. Docket No.:

Brown
09/478,071
511-003

Art Group:
Examiner:

1616
Levy, N.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, postage paid, in an envelope addressed to: Box Non Fee Amendment, Assistant Commission for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231

on 7/8/02

By: 